

## **SLCGP Planning Committee Meeting**

Indiana Government Center South – Harrison Hall, Conference Room 18

**Tracy Barnes - Chair**

### **Meeting Minutes**

January 23, 2023, at 10:00am

#### **Voting Members Present:**

Aaron Hyden, MSD of Wabash County  
Andrew VanZee, Indiana Hospital Association  
Brad Hagg, Indiana Department of Education  
Craig Jackson, Indiana University  
Hemant Jain, Indiana Office of Technology CISO  
Jeremy Stevens, Howard County  
Joel Thacker, Indiana Department of Homeland Security Executive Director  
Kent Kroft, Tippecanoe County  
Lisa Cannon, Madison County  
Lloyd Keith, City of Gary  
Mat Trampski, Purdue University  
Timothy Renick, City of Carmel  
Tony Peffley, Elkhart County  
Tracy Barnes, Indiana Office of Technology CIO  
Vernon Lutz, City of Evansville/ Vanderburgh County

#### **Advisory Members Present:**

Becca McCuaig, AIM  
Chetrice Mosley-Romero, IECC  
David Cartmel, IOT  
Graig Lubsen, IOT  
J.D. Henry, DHS/CISA  
Kim Snyder, IDHS  
Jonathan Whitham, IDHS  
Ryan Hoff, AIC  
Tad Stahl, IOT  
Taylor Hollenbeck, IOT

#### **Members Not Present:**

Amy Lindsey, Franklin County (voting)  
David Steward, Indiana Supreme Court (advisory)  
Tony Peffley, Elkhart County (voting)

#### **Call to Order and Roll Call**

Meeting was called to order at 10:08am by Chair Tracy Barnes. Taylor Hollenbeck called roll and announced quorum.

## **Approval of November Minutes**

1. A motion was made by Timothy Renick to approve November's minutes. The motion was seconded by Aaron Hyden.
  - a. A voice vote approved the minutes.

## **Review and Approve the Addition/Removal of SLCGP Planning Committee Members**

1. Removal of Brad Walker as a voting member of the SLCGP Planning Committee. Brad did not accept his nomination to the Committee.
  - a. A motion was made by Brad Hagg and seconded by Timothy Renick.
  - b. A voice vote approved the removal of Brad Walker from the "Committee."
2. Removal of Elliot Anderson as an advisory members and proxy to Director Joel Thacker. Elliot recently changed roles at another state agency.
  - a. A motion was made by Andrew VanZee and seconded by Vernon Lutz.
  - b. A voice vote approved the removal of Elliot Anderson from the "Committee."
3. Addition of Kent Kroft as a voting member of the SLCGP Planning Committee.
  - a. A motion was made by Jeremy Stevens and seconded by Timothy Renick.
  - b. A voice vote approved the addition of Kent Kroft as a voting member of the "Committee."
4. Additions of David Cartmel, J.D. Henry, and Jonathan Whitham as advisory members of the SLCGP Planning Committee.
  - a. Jonathan Whitham will also serve as proxy for Director Joel Thacker.
  - b. A motion was made by Brad Hagg and seconded by Vernon Lutz.
  - c. A voice vote approved the additions of David Cartmel, J.D. Henry, and Jonathan Whitham to the "Committee" as advisory members.

## **Update from Federal Partner (DHS/CISA) – J.D. Henry**

1. J.D. Henry provided an update on behalf of DHS/CISA and requested feedback (negative and positive) of the current program. Open to questions and/or take your concerns to DHS/CISA for review and answers.
2. 54 out of 56 eligible entities applied for the 2022 funds; Florida and South Dakota were the two that did not submit applications. 11 State Plans have been submitted; 6 should be approved soon and 5 are going back to the respective states for review. Indiana is NOT one of the 11 submitted.
3. Indiana has submitted our initial application but are looking to submit the State Plan by the end of the summer, but that final approval is what releases the federal dollars.

### **Committee Discussion:**

- Florida and South Dakota dollars will be sent back to the general pot and divvied up between the entities that did apply – we don't know how much that will be yet.
- Those 2 states can apply for 2023-2025 dollars.
- We can review other State Plans, but we are not sharing until sensitive information is redacted. The Plans do range from high level to descriptive.

## **SLCGP NOFO Overview – David Cartmel**

1. PowerPoint Presentation highlighting the NOFO and requirements and constraints of the SLCGP Planning Committee to finalize State Plan and application.
2. SLCGP Planning Committee can either be prescriptive or general when it comes to drafting the Plan, or we can leverage a Plan that may already be in place. Indiana leans towards the general option to allow more flexibility with providing services vs. funding.

### **Committee Discussion:**

- New Hampshire has Workforce Training in their Plan by considering Security+. They would like to raise the foundational level of knowledge for cybersecurity employees serving their local governments.

- There are matching requirements for the bill. If the State provides the service, the State would provide the match. If the locality would like the funds, they would provide the match. The match increases 10% each year. You cannot use current federal government funds to match this program.
- The goal with NIST & CIS is to build upon what the state/locality is already using. The federal program provides seven best practices they think locals should follow, but the State can determine what standards to consider.
- Locality is required to use NCSR and CISA scanning services. DHS/CISA uses these services to get a better understanding at the macro/micro level of threats. They use this data to request funding from Congress.
- There is no timeline for approval once the Plan is submitted. We can use this to our advantage to help with volume purchasing. The administrative review is done by FEMA, CISA reviews the content. Plans that have already been submitted and approved were done within 2 months during the holidays.
- IOT will help with dissemination of the Plan and services to local governments, but the purpose of the SLCGP Planning Committee is to represent the locals and assist with messaging.

#### **Update on the State Cyber Plan – Hemant Jain**

1. There is a template provided by DHS/CISA where major elements have been laid out.
2. Have reviewed other states' Plans and will provide those to the Committee once identifying information is redacted. Most are vague in next steps and don't list certain projects.

#### **Committee Discussion:**

- Next steps to draft the Plan include looking at other states' Plans and using our assessment data to map against best practices and services offered.
- Who is accountable when it's an MSP running the local entity's technology/cybersecurity.
  - Ryan Hoff mentioned the County Commissioners are the signatory entity for the MSPs.
- Best practices are easy to mention but we need to implement them.
  - Maybe we roll out the best practices/recommendations incrementally since it will be a culture change that's needed at the local level.
- IOT will send out a list of services they already offer local governments, and then we can look at other services.
  - Training for incident response came up.

#### **Local Government Visits/Initiatives Update – Tad Stahl, Taylor Hollenbeck**

1. IOT, IDOE, and IDHS hit 92 counties with 46 meetings. The meetings last 2 hours with legislative sponsorship assisting with the local government invitations.
2. Ransomware has leveled off and BEC is becoming the most common threat.
3. Local governments want the resources and services, and most of them either have an inhouse IT professional or MSP.

#### **Purdue University & Indiana University Local Government Assessment Update – Mat Trampski, Craig Jackson**

1. The goal is to create the baseline and then go back and measure improvement over time – this will also help measure effectiveness of the program and resources offered.
2. Have received roughly 70 applications, but the group is looking at who will be the priority (county, town, townships, libraries...)
3. Still developing the methodology and scope of what is being measured. The priority is for the assessments to be efficient and for the recommendations afterwards to be tailored to the specific locality.

#### **Committee Discussion:**

- The assessments will have some of the 16 elements incorporated into them.

- Purdue has been assessing local governments for the past 18 months, so we will use that data for the time being.

### **New Business Discussion**

1. Discussion of Virtual Attendance – Tracy Barnes
  - a. Preference is to have the meetings in person once a month, but we are moving the time to later in the day to account for travel.
2. Open Door Policy – Jonathan Whitham
  - a. When having a meeting in person, the Committee must post a Notice 48 hours in advance and the Agenda outside the door of the meeting room.
  - b. The Committee should not support subcommittees due to quorum and open door policies.
  - c. When communicating offline, there should be no decisions or voting due to open door policy.

### **Adjournment**

Mat Trampski motioned for the meeting to adjourn. Brad Hagg seconded the motion. The SLCGP Planning Committee adjourned at 11:58am.